REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE

Form Approved OMB No. 0704-0188

Public reporting burden for this collection of information is estimated to average 1 hour per response, including the time for reviewing instructions, searching existing data sources, gathering and maintaining the data needed, and completing and reviewing the collection of information. Send comments regarding this burden estimate only, other aspect of this collection of information, including suggestions for reducing this burden, to Washington Headquarters Services, Directorate for Information Operations and Reports, 1215 Jefferson Davis Highway, Suite 1204, Arlington, VA 22202-4302, and to the Office of Management and Budget, Paperwork Reduction Project (07804-0188), Washington, DC 20503.

Tradinington, DO 20000.			
1. AGENCY USE ONLY (LEAVE BLANK)	2. REPORT DATE	3. REPORT TYPE AND DATES COVERED	
	23 April 1999	Viewgraphs	
4. TITLE AND SUBTITLE		5. FUNDING NUMBERS	
Choosing a Quality System: A Com			
6. AUTHOR(S)			
Kevin Abercrombie			
7. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES)		8. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION REPORT NUMBER	
Naval Air Warfare Center Aircraft Division		REPORT NOWIDER	
22347 Cedar Point Road, Unit #6			
Patuxent River, Maryland 20670-1			
9. SPONSORING/MONITORING AGENCY NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES)		10. SPONSORING/MONITORING AGENCY REPORT NUMBER	
Naval Air Systems Command			
47123 Buse Road, Unit IPT		·	
Patuxent River, Maryland 20670-15			
11. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES			
	2		
12a. DISTRIBUTION/AVAILABILITY STATE	12b. DISTRIBUTION CODE		
Approved for public release; distribu	ution is unlimited.		

13. ABSTRACT (Maximum 200 words)

19991004 321

14. SUBJECT TERMS			15. NUMBER OF PAGES
ISO 9000 ANSI Z	18		
			16. PRICE CODE
		T to OFOURITY OF A OCIFICATION	OO LIMITATION OF ARCTRACT
17. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF REPORT	18. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE	19. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF ABSTRACT	20. LIMITATION OF ABSTRACT
Unclassified	Unclassified	Unclassified	UL

A Comparison of ISO 9000 and ANSI Z540

Kevin Abercrombie

Naval Air Warfare Center, Aircraft Division

Patuxent River, MD

CLEARED FOR OPEN PUBLICATION

23 Gram 89 PUBLIC AFFAIRS OFFICE NAVAL AIR SYSTEMS COMMAN

I Gownal

- Why use a Quality System (Excuses Against)
- 'We've done it this way forever....
- Does not mean there isn't a better way.
- Does not mean your doing it right
- Just means the system has never been evaluated
- 'We're compliant with'
- How do you know?

- Why use a Quality System (Excuses Against)
- We produce a good product, I've never heard any complaints
- Have you been listening
- Have you asked your customers

- Why use a Quality System (Excuses Against)
- 'Don't fix it if it ain't broke'
- How do you know it isn't broke if you don't check?
- 'We use to have that but it didn't work'
- Personnel and management failed to make it work.
- Not monitored
- Not enforced

- Why use a quality system. (Reasons For)
- Changing global and national economies.
- Force changes in how companies conduct business in order stay competitive.
- Trade barriers
- Trickle down to even the smallest companies.
- Customers impose quality system requirements
- To meet their customers requirements.

• What is the benefit

(Similarities between both systems)

- Requires Documented Processes
- Say what you do do what you say.
- Requires Management Commitment
- State management commitment to quality
- Requires Audits of the Processes
- · Verify the processes are performed according to procedure.

- What is the benefit
- Requires you establish benchmarks and set goals
- Monitor and measure your system
- Requires Corrective Actions
- Customer complaints
- Audit Findings
- Failing to meet objectives

- What is the benefit
- Requires use of trained and qualified personnel.
- Personnel have to have the knowledge and skills to perform their job.
- Formal Schooling
- On the Job Training
 Continues Triaining

- What is the Benefit
- Continuos Improvement
- Process Evaluation (Audits, Corrective Action)
- Reduce costs
- » Reduced Rework
- » Prevent Lost business
- Increase Productivity
- » Better, Faster & Cheaper (Choose three)

- Differences between the two systems
- ANSI
- specifically written for calibration and testing labs
- ISO
- Broad scope pertains to manufacturers as well as service providers.

- Differences Between the two systems
- ANSI Requires you prove proficiency by participation in:
- Measurement Assurance Programs
- Proficiency Testing
- Inter-laboratory comparisons
- ISO relies on continuos process improvement to achieve proficiency

- Differences between the systems
- ANSI results in Certification
- The Quality Management System meets the requirements of the standard
- Laboratory is capable of performing measurements within the scope of the competency
- ISO results in Registration
- requirement of the standard as it pertains to the • The Quality Management System meets the scope of registration.

- Costs
- ANSI Based on number of disciplines being accredited.
- Number of auditors and technical assessors.
- Number of proficiency tests.
- \$3000 for 1st discipline plus \$800 for additional
- plus travel costs for auditors and assessors
- Pre assessment and post assessments

- ISO can cost less
- Based on the size of the company
- Larger companies require more time and/or auditors

Example Based on a small (<10 employees)

calibration laboratory performing three measurement areas in Chicago, II.

- ANSI Z540 Costs (NVLAP estimate)
- Three (3) Disciplines
- Four (4) member audit team traveling from various parts of the
- Three (3) day audit
- Optional
- one (1) day pre audit
- Follow up audits

ISO 9000 Costs

(Using Local Assessor)

- Flat Rate for audit
- Two (2) member team from local area.
- Three(3) day audit
- Yearly follow up audits
- Optional
- one (1) day pre- audit
- Follow Up audits

• ANSI Z540

- \$4600 (\$3000 1st discipline +
 \$800 for each additional field)
- \$2500 (Per Diem & Travel for four auditors for three days)
- \$500 (application fee)
- \$ 3000 (billed at cost, estimate of \$1000 for each discipline)
- \$ 10600 (total for 1 year does not include out years)

• ISO 9000

- \$5000 (Flat Fee, includes application fee)
- \$250 (miscellaneous travel expenses, local auditors)
- \$2000 (Two (2) Yearly Follow up audits)
- \$1800 (pre assessment)
- -\$9050 (total for 3 years)

- Summary
- Both systems verify the Quality Management System
- ANSI requires you prove your capabilities
- ISO can be less expensive.

- Summary
- What system to use depends on your customers requirements.
- Budget
- Company goals